

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 09, 2009, considered and rejected claims 8-10, 13, 14, 22-24 and 27-30. Claims 8-10, 13, 14, 22-24 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Waldorf* et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0038228) and *Campbell* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,970) and *Meinig* (U.S. Patent No. 6,964,714).¹

By this response, claims 8-10, 13, 14, 22-24, and 27-30 are canceled, while claims 31-41 are added. Claims 31-41 remain pending of which claims 31 and 35 are independent.

The previous claims have been canceled and new claims added to provide better clarity to the claim sets. The new claims are directed to the same general embodiments as previously presented. Claim 31 is directed to the embodiment primarily described in paragraphs 28-33. This embodiment covers the synchronous reporting of data from the applications. In contrast, claim 35 is directed to the embodiment where the data may be, but does not necessarily have to be, received out-of-order. Claims 34 and 41 are intended to be computer storage medium equivalents of each of the method claims.

The new claims have been presented primarily to better emphasize how the instance and continuation data tables are used. For example, the use of these tables allows data from subsequent applications to be linked up with the data from the previous applications even though each application uses a different ID to represent the instance of the business process. For example, the continuation data table is used to determine the parent ID. In the synchronous example, the parent ID is the first application whereas in the asynchronous example, the current parent ID may be the ID of any previous application that has reported data. Further, the continuation table is used to locate the corresponding record in the instance data table so that the reported data is entered into the appropriate record. It is noted that an important benefit of the invention is that it allows a way to correlate data that uses different IDs without having to recode the applications, or provide a translating intermediary (as in *Waldorf*) for the applications to intercommunicate. In one embodiment, all that is necessary is that a preceding application be able to receive the ID of the succeeding application in the business process.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

In view of the new claims which contain clear limitations directed to the use of the tables for correlating data, Applicant submits that the rejections are overcome. The Waldorf reference was the only reference cited to reject these main aspects of the current claims. Waldorf is directed to a system that is used to monitor and track the performance of business processes. Initially, it is noted that the present invention and Waldorf are directed to different aspects. Waldorf, for example, provides a way for different applications to communicate by providing a translating intermediary. This intermediary translates one applications protocol or format into a standard format used by a queue. Then when messages are sent from the queue, an outgoing translator translates the messages into the format appropriate for the receiving application. This queue also provides a way for the central system to control and monitor the entire system even when it encompasses multiple applications on different machines. The system uses the queue to receive messages that primarily relay information regarding the completion of an action of the business process. These messages can relay information regarding specific aspects of a step in the business process such as shipping information. Although database tables are used to track and store information in Waldorf's system, there is nothing similar to the continuation data table or to the correlation of disparate IDs as in the present invention.

Also, although using the teachings of Waldorf, it would likely be possible to obtain the same result (i.e. linking data together from different applications), it could not do so in the straightforward simplistic manner as provided by the present invention. One benefit of the present invention is that it provides an easy way for a standard user to receive information from various applications that perform different portions of a business process. Because all data from the different applications is stored in a single record of the instance database, it is straightforward to retrieve information such as "How many shipments were processed and delivered in the past X hours?" The present invention would be able to resolve this query by simply looking for records in the single instance table that match the criteria. In contrast, Waldorf would require complex queries over the many different data stores to piece together sufficient information to arrive at the same result.

Additionally, as embodied in the dependent claims, the present invention allows a way to filter out data that would give a false report. For example, if data has been received out of order, it can be hidden from queries such as the one above. *See, e.g.* ¶ 35; Claims 37, 39.

In view of the new claims, Applicant submits that the cited art fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims such as the following limitations from claim 35:

subsequent to an application performing a portion of the business process, receiving data from the application that was generated during the performance of the business process, the data being represented with an identifier;

searching a continuation data table, that stores correlated identifiers, for a record that includes the identifier such that:

upon locating a record that includes the identifier, a correlating identifier is retrieved from the record and used to locate a record in an instance data table that includes data represented by the correlating identifier, and upon locating the record in the instance data table, the data represented by the identifier is inserted into the record in the instance data table; and

upon failing to locate a record that includes the identifier, a new record is added to the instance data table that includes the data and the identifier;

subsequent to the application completing its portion of the business process, *receiving a correlation event* that includes the identifier and a subsequent identifier, the subsequent identifier corresponding to a subsequent application that performs a subsequent portion of the business process such that the subsequent application represents data generated during the performance of the subsequent portion of the business process using the subsequent identifier, the identifier being different from the subsequent identifier; and

searching the continuation data table for a record that includes the identifier in conjunction with a different identifier such that:

upon locating a record that includes the identifier, a new record is added to the continuation data table that correlates the different identifier with the subsequent identifier; and

upon failing to locate a record that includes the identifier, a new record is added to the continuation data table that correlates the identifier with the subsequent identifier.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner

provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 29th day of September, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian D. Tucker/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BDT:gd
2543948_1